

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-0582V

UNPUBLISHED

THE ESTATE OF APOLINAR HASEM  
PERDOMO FELIZ, by and through  
Administrator, BIENCHIS Y. ESTEVA-  
FELIZ,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: May 19, 2020

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;  
Guillain-Barre Syndrome (GBS)

*John Richard Taylor, Zaytoun Law Firm, Raleigh, NC, for petitioner.*

*Dhairya Divyakant Jani, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

On April 17, 2019, the Estate of Apolina Hasem Perdomo Feliz, by and through Administrator Biechis Y.L Esteva-Feliz, filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that, due to a March 12, 2017 influenza (“flu”) vaccine, Apolinar Hasem Perdomo Feliz suffered from Guillain-Barre syndrome (“GBS”), which led to his subsequent death on April 21, 2017. Petition at 1, 9-12. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On May 15, 2020, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent agrees that Petitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table and Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation for GBS. *Id.* at 5. Respondent states that the scope of damages to be awarded "is limited to the decedent's GBS and its related sequelae only." *Id.*

**In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master